

**State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BOARD
Meeting Report**

Date/Place: April 19, 2001/Department of Administration, Providence, Rhode Island

Purpose: To receive a report on the Retreat and to discuss resulting issues and next steps.

Members Present: Barbara Weaver, OLIS (Chair); Hon. Daniel DaPonte, RI Senate; William Fagan, DLT; Michael Hogan, RI House Policy Office; Bruce Reirden, Care New England; Kathleen Spangler, MHRH; A.T. Wall, DOC; Christopher Wessells, URI; Don Wolfe, Brown University

Members Absent: Hon. Scott Avedisian, Mayor, City of Warwick; William Ferland, Office of Higher Education; Hon. Edward S. Inman III, Secretary of State; Janet Levesque, RILOCAT; Stephen McAllister, Budget Office, DOA; Dexter Merry, Public Telecommunications Authority; James R. Monti, Jr., West Warwick School Department; Joseph Pangborn, Department of Elementary & Secondary Education; Joan Ress Reeves, Library Board of RI

Other Attendees: James Berard, DOC; Tim Bonin, Governor's Policy Office; Connie McGreavy, WRB; Karen Mellor, OLIS

Reporting: Carol Ciotola, OLIS

Chair's Report—Ms. Weaver reported on:

- new Board appointments: Senator Daniel DaPonte as the designee of Hon. Frank Caprio—Senate Finance Committee, and Hon. Scott Avedisian, Mayor—City of Warwick, representing local government.
- a recommendation resulting from the retreat: An invitation was extended to Tom Schumpert, Economic Development Corporation, to attend IRMB meetings—awaiting a response. An invitation to attend IRMB meetings was also extended to Tim Bonin, Governor's Policy Office—introduced at the meeting.
- a *Providence Sunday Journal* article (April 15) about OSHEAN and the good work that is being done in this area.
- contract negotiations with the proposed vendor to develop a Web Portal: Preliminary negotiations will begin with a meeting on April 23 to discuss issues pertaining to the DMV and Division of Taxation. Representatives from the DMV, Taxation, Budget and Purchases will attend. The Chair suggested that the IRMB be represented as well, since the Board has responsibility for approving policies that are required to be in effect when the various interactive functions take place. Mr. Wolfe will check his schedule and advise. Messrs. Fagan and Berard will plan to attend. On April 26, a meeting is scheduled to begin contract negotiations with the potential vendor. In attendance will be the Chair, legal counsel for the state, a representative from the potential vendor company and its legal counsel. Mr. Fagan: When will non-revenue agencies be allowed to participate? Ms. Weaver: A schedule will be worked out with the vendor. Subsequent to these meetings, there will be a meeting for interested agencies to receive a demonstration of the process. At the appropriate time, the vendor will prepare individual agreements for participating departments. Mr. Fagan: DLT would like to participate as soon as possible.

Update on IRMB Retreat—Outcomes/Issues/Next Steps

Mr. Wall: Thought an appropriate concern was raised about Article 6 at the Retreat. DOC was not aware of its contents—were IRMB members aware of it; and if so, had anyone commented? Ms. Weaver: Not aware of any Board member commenting on this article, then explained the Budget Office's intent—to put into law an ongoing funding stream for IT. The area of concern is Section 29-9-4. Mr. Wall: Echoed the Board's concern about the level of detail requested in this section. While the Article is modeled on the Capital Budget process, Article 6 is not organized in the same way. While the Capital Budget process includes instructions and definitions from the Budget Office, no such structure is apparent for Article 6, which could mean that departments would be left to their own devices.

Mr. Wolfe moved to:

Recommend that the Chair send a letter to Director Carl urging that Section 29-9-4 of proposed Article 6 be eliminated, since the language is not appropriate to the role, time table and specificity of the Five-Year Plan.

There was no second to this motion. Discussion ensued, and the following points were recorded:

- Mr. Fagan: Eliminate Article 6 completely and rework it to include its many good points.
- Ms. Spangler: There needs to be a level of statewide planning for infrastructure. Implement this level of planning instead of eliminating Article 6, since it was put in as a line item for technology and was highlighted by the Governor at the Budget presentation. The Governor is to be commended for establishing a technology fund. Suggested that Board members meet with Governor's Office and Budget Office staff to develop mutually acceptable language. Mr. Wolfe: Agreed there is a need for a plan to set out how this money would be expended.
- Mr. Wall: Pleased with the Board's recommendation to meet with the Director. It's a more effective approach to resolve this issue. Ms. Weaver: Dr. Carl's response to the Board's earlier invitation to meet was that he would not plan to do so until it looked likely that this Article were going to pass. It might be useful to send a letter from the Board expressing its concerns and requesting a meeting. Mr. Wall: Emphasized that the tone of the letter would need to support the Governor's initiative and point out how important it would be to replicate the successful Capital Budget process for IT. The Board's concerns could then be presented about the mechanism for submission and review process included in Article 6 and that the Board is not confident it would accomplish the objectives that the Governor has so worthily proposed. Ms. Spangler: Pointed out that if the article were removed, the appropriation would be lost.
- Mr. Wolfe: The CIO must oversee IT planning, and the Board should back up this position. The effect of this Article places that control in the Budget Office. Ms. Weaver: By law the IRMB is supposed to be developing a five-year plan. There is concern that with the level of detail and specificity required by Article 6, it would not be possible to meet this requirement, which, in turn, could mean that the projects would not receive funding. Suggested sending a letter limiting the Board's concern to Section 29-9-4. Dr. Carl is not aware of the Board's specific concerns, only that they pertain to Article 6. Ms. Spangler: Suggested wording to the effect that the Board favors Article 6, except for Section 29-9-4. Since the final language would most likely be negotiated, she suggested leaving that work to them, instead of prescribing workable language.

Mr. Wolfe moved to recommend:

That the IRMB send a letter to Robert L. Carl, Jr., Ph.D., Director of Administration, expressing:

- 1. their appreciation to the Governor for recognizing in his proposed FY 2002 budget the need for an on-going source of funding for information technology;**
- 2. their understanding that the intent of Article 6 in the proposed FY 2002 budget is to institute a process similar to the process already in place for capital budget proposals; but at the same time**
- 3. their concern that the new section 29-9-4 in the proposed Article 6:**
 - a. inappropriately places responsibility on the IRMB for oversight and approval of detailed proposals for IT expenditures for individual departments, and**

- b. contains an unworkable timeline and specificity of requirements for proposals to be submitted by departments to the IRMB, and for the IRMB to forward its recommendations to the Governor, the General Assembly, and the state budget office.**

And that the IRMB request a meeting with Dr. Carl to discuss these issues well before there is negotiation with the General Assembly concerning the proposed Article 6. The IRMB recommends that section 29-9-4 be removed from Article 6 and that a process be developed to ascertain needed information for budgeting purposes without having it specified in law.

Mr. Reirden seconded the motion, which was unanimously approved.

Ms. Weaver: Clarified that the letter to Director Carl would be sent by the Chair at the request of the Board.

Five-Year Plan—At the retreat, the Board adopted the elements of a new Five-Year IRM Plan. The Vision and Mission statements remain the same as in the previous plan. The IRMB recommended the following: (1) Combine two goals areas—Public Access and E-Government. (2) Add two goal areas—Telecommunications Integration and Security/Privacy Policy. (3) Develop Objectives, Benchmarks, and Evaluation for IRMB review and approval. (4) Include major accomplishments, as well as future-oriented activities. IRMB's Working Group will work on these elements and draft a format for discussion at the next Working Group meeting.

Project Investment Document (PID)—The Working Group was scheduled to meet shortly after the retreat. The Board recommended that the Group postpone its discussion of Article 6 and the PID. However, the issue of the PID was of such great interest to the group, it was discussed.

- Ms. Weaver: Explained at Mr. Wall's request the relationship between Article 6 and the PID. The Rhode Island PID was generated by a voluminous version in effect in Arizona and adapted for Rhode Island by Mr. Fagan. Board members suggested it be further shortened, though all agreed that there needs to be a list of IT projects planned. The result was development of a draft Agency IT Survey by the Working Group, which was sent out to department heads. In this way, if Article 6 were to go forward, the information required by July 1 would be available.
- Mr. Fagan: Many Working Group members thought the PID to be a great document to work with because it provides a format to develop white papers if necessary. It was also suggested that the PID document be altered to meet some of the requirements of Article 6.
- Mr. Wall: Requested clarification about which version will be required for IT project submittals to the Budget Office—the existing process or the proposed one. Ms. Weaver: The existing submittal process for IT projects to the Budget Office would be eliminated if Article 6 were to be implemented.
- Ms. Spangler: If Article 6 is implemented, Board members should meet with the Budget Office to decide on the proper form to be used for submittals.
- Mr. Wall: Explained the Capital Development Project process at Mr. Wolfe's request. Mr. Wolfe: Why were IT projects not viewed by the Budget Office as capital projects? Suggested that the Capital Development Project process be incorporated into the IT project funding process. Ms. Spangler: Explained that it took several years and budget cycles to develop that process and to determine what actually constitutes capital for budgeting purposes. The state now has the same situation with IT projects. There are enormous expenditures relative to putting infrastructure in place; whereas, replacing equipment would come out of an operating budget. The rules are changing, and an

appropriate funding mechanism is needed. “White papers” submitted by the Governor this year were consolidated into one e-Government proposal, which was a very good beginning to identify a funding stream. Mr. Wolfe: Pointed out that sometimes funding is available through a Capital Budget for infrastructure; however, there is no funding mechanism established to continue funding for maintenance purposes.

Committee Reports—Working Group/Legislation Committee/Policy Development Committee

Updates on the Working Group and Legislation Committee were discussed earlier in the meeting. Since Dean Gandel was not able to attend the Retreat, Ms. Weaver reported she had previously discussed with him the Board’s recommendation to focus on a policy for Security/Privacy. As a result, she proposed that the May 17 meeting be extended to serve as a half-day Workshop, to discuss both the state’s current security situation and its future needs. An outside speaker will attend to present issues concerning best practices. Because of the nature of the discussion—state security—the IRMB will meet in “Executive Session.” All agreed to the half-day Workshop on May 17, from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Other business—Mr. Wolfe pointed to the need for staff support and funding for the IRMB.

Next Regular Meeting--June 21, 2001. Ms. Weaver stated that the Draft Five-Year Plan should be ready for presentation and discussion prior to the next regular meeting. A request for approval will be sought at the June meeting.